United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/815,478	03/31/2004	James Loran Ball	ALTRP134/A1466 6370		
51501 7590 01/10/2007 BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP		EXAMINER			
ATTN: ALTERA			LAI, VINCENT		
P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2181		
•					
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/10/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	•
10/8	/815,478 BALL, JAMES LORAN		AN
Exa	miner	Art Unit	
Vind	cent Lai	2181	

	Vincent Lai	2181	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aft otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in c	idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejecti	on.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date		126(a) and the engrapsia	to autonoian fac
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF APPEAL	" " OT OFF 44 OT	er de de la companya	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	
AMENDMENTS	and the second second	20 1 1 2 1 1 1-	
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	onsideration and/or search (see NO ow);	TE below);	• .
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		timely filed amondmy	ent cancaling the
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		Il be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		•	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	ut before or on the date of filing a N id sufficient reasons why the affidat	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and .
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by see attached.		condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).	John Shi	26
	SUPE	DONALD SPARE RVISORY PATENT	CS EXATELLIZE

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Request for Reconsideration

The following is a response in regards to the remarks submitted on 15 December 2006 regarding U.S. Patent Application Serial Number 10/815,478.

Examiner is not persuaded by arguments.

Applicant argues that the limitation "substantially all multi-byte aligned branch instructions" is not indefinite, which the Examiner still disagrees with. The Examiner recognizes the points addressed by Applicant, but do not feel that the claim limitations reflect an accurate position taken by Applicant. It is noted that Applicant has said, "The group member can vary depending on the particular architecture," which Examiner feels, if incorporated in the claims, may overcome an indefinite rejection.

Applicant also argues that reference used does not teach byte-alignment. Applicant does not explain as where/how the reference used does not teach the limitation of byte-alignment, but merely makes conjectures regarding Intel architecture and summarizes the motivation for the invention. The optional feature of 4, 8, or 16 byte alignments taught by Intel does not have to be used and thus any byte alignment can be used. Examiner is not persuaded by argument present by Applicant.

Art Unit: 2181

Applicant argues that common subcircuitry is not taught by the Intel reference and previous ALU example given by Examiner does not teach common subcircuitry. Without conceding correctness of previous example, Examiner would like to present another example. A decoder would be another common subcircuitry that processes branch instructions and non-branch instructions, including an immediate field. One having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that Intel architecture has an instruction decoder and thus Intel does include common subcircuitry.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vincent Lai whose telephone number is (571) 272-6749. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:30 (First BiWeek Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald Sparks can be reached on (571) 272-4201. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2181

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vincent Lai Examiner Art Unit 2181

vl January 8, 2007

DONALD **6PARKS**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER